

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/324,368	<b>Applicant(s)</b> NAGAOKA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Jeffrey C. Mullis	<b>Art Unit</b> 1711	

**All Participants:**

(1) Jeffrey C. Mullis.

(2) Linda Deschere.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 18 February 2004

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

*NONE*

**Claims discussed:**

*3, 8-11*

**Prior art documents discussed:**

*none*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

RECEIVED  
 Priority Examiner  
 Art Unit 1711

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicants' attorney was contacted to cancel claim 3 which was previously indicated as drawn to a non-elected species but which was now dependent on a rejected base claim. Applicants' attorney agreed to do this by examiner's amendment. Applicants' attorney was told that claims 8-11 would be cancelled as being drawn to an invention non elected without traverse. .